



Tradition and Innovation in American Philanthropy

Author(s): Merle Curti

Source: *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Apr. 21, 1961), pp. 146-156

Published by: [American Philosophical Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/985626>

Accessed: 01-02-2016 07:31 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/985626?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Philosophical Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY

MERLE CURTI

Frederick Jackson Turner Professor of History, The University of Wisconsin

(Read November 11, 1960, in the Symposium on the History and Role of
Philanthropy in American Society)

AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY, defined as private giving for public purposes, has derived much of its ideology, its law, and its institutional organization from Judaeo-Christian tradition as well as from English common and statutory law and experience. One would, however, expect this heritage to have been modified by the distinctive aspects of American life. These include separation of church and state, the federal system, frontier conditions and the concept of abundance, the democratic repudiation of the idea of a static and structured society with an hereditary class of needy poor, succeeding waves of immigration, and slavery and the problems growing out of it. The emphasis in this country on the voluntary association or society and, in due course, on the business ideal of efficiency, might also be expected to affect patterns of giving. This paper is concerned both with the role of tradition in American philanthropy and with some of its modifications.

A related problem that is also considered is the contention often made that American philanthropy, at least in some respects, has shown a special inventiveness and creativity in meeting individual and social needs largely neglected or inadequately provided by government.¹ This is a thorny question. Comparison with other countries cannot easily be made. Whatever is said about British philanthropy must be tentative until studies for the Victorian and post-Victorian periods are at hand comparable to the thorough and illuminating work of W. K. Jordan for the Tudor and Stuart era. Relatively little is known about the nature and amount of philanthropy in countries other than Britain.² Furthermore, the problems associated with the nature of inventive-

ness and creativity are among the most difficult that an historian can tackle.

A large share of total American giving has reflected traditional Old World patterns of ideology, law, and institutional implementation. This was notably true in the colonial period although local conditions and needs resulted in a selective process. In ideology, the doctrine of Christian stewardship of riches was central in Puritan and Quaker thought. It was also evident in Anglican teaching. This doctrine was exemplified in such representative appeals for benevolence as John Winthrop's *A Modell of Christian Charity*, Cotton Mather's *Essays to do Good*, and the *Magnalia*, Whitfield's exhortations for contributions to orphan asylums, as well as in the precepts of Penn, Benezet, and Woolman and in Anglican pleas for the inculcation of piety through libraries and for the conversion and nurture of Indians and Negroes.³ In the legal sphere, English statutory and common law were applied differently according to local conditions, but there was little significant innovation.⁴ And dependence on English institutional arrangements was reflected in gifts and bequests for the free schools in Virginia associated with the names of Symes and Eaton, for the Redwood Library in Newport, for the colonial col-

¹ Curti, Merle, American philanthropy and the national character, *American Quarterly* 10: 420-437, 1958.

² Jordan, W. K., *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1959; Clough, Shepard B., *Philanthropy and the welfare state of Europe*, *Pol. Sci. Quart.* 75: 87-92, 1960.

³ Winthrop, John, *A modell of Christian charity*, Winthrop Papers, *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 282-295, 1931; Mather, Cotton, *Magnalia Christi Americana* 1: 102, Boston, 1855; Tolles, Frederick B., and E. Gordon Alderfer, eds., *The witness of William Penn*, 44-57, New York, Macmillan, 1957; Gummere, A. M., ed. John Woolman, *Journal*, New York, Macmillan, 1922; Vaux, Roberts, *Memoirs of the life of Anthony Benezet*, Philadelphia, 1817; Bray, Thomas, *Proposals for the encouragement and promoting of religion and learning in the foreign plantations*, *Thomas Bray Publications*, no. 3: 41-43; no. 6: 10-11, London, 1701; Knight, Edgar W., *A documentary history of education in the South before 1860* 1: 1-353, Chapel Hill, Univ. of N. C., 1949.

⁴ Zollman, Carl, *American law of charities*, 4-6, Milwaukee, Bruce Pub. Co., 1924; Wyllie, Irvin G., *The search for an American law of charity, 1776-1844*, *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.* 48: 203-204, 1959.

leges, for orphanages, for burying grounds, and for the mixture of public and private support in our first hospital in Philadelphia.⁵ Adherence to British custom was also evidenced in gifts that supplemented public provision for the poor, an example being that of Robert Keanys and Henry Webb in 1662 for Boston's first poorhouse.⁶ When disastrous fire destroyed a large part of Boston's shops and homes in 1760, contributions from the churches in the several towns of the province, and from neighboring colonies, mirrored the traditional response to similar catastrophes in England.⁷

Although in the early Republic there was much talk about establishing a distinctively American culture, in the realm of philanthropy there was no sharp break with traditional ideology. To be sure, the secularization of the doctrine of Christian stewardship begun by Franklin was gradually extended and was given dramatic formulation by Andrew Carnegie in the later nineteenth century. But the doctrine itself was old and continued to be an inestimably important factor in a great deal of nineteenth-century giving. It continued to be significant in the philanthropy of the twentieth century as well.

In the course of the nineteenth century other emphases also continued to be made in ideology. As in England and in the colonial period, the simple appeal to compassion figured in philanthropic appeals. This received considerable elaboration in the humanitarian movements of the pre-Civil War period.⁸ The argument that giving for the establishment of churches, schools, and colleges was good insurance against heterodoxy in religion and politics was more frequently

heard, especially in periods of rising social tension and democratic challenge to the established order. Thus, appeals for the support of Christian colleges as a way of strengthening conservative values were often made in the 1840's and 1850's in the literature of the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West and in that of later solicitations for other benevolent causes.⁹ The most important development in the ideological aspects of philanthropy was the emphasis on self-help and rehabilitation of the indigent poor under the auspices of voluntary associations. This emphasis became the guiding principle in the charity organization movement of the last three decades of the nineteenth century, when it found congenial soil in the new urban society. It fitted in with the vogue of the self-made man idea and with the increasing acceptance of the ideal of scientific administration of help to those in need. But the idea had been formulated and implemented by the Reverend Thomas Chalmers in Glasgow in the early Victorian period. It had quickly found a response in America and inspired or strengthened pioneer efforts in Boston and New York to substitute self-help, personal visitation by volunteers, and rehabilitation, for dependence on public support.¹⁰

On the institutional level, adherence to custom in giving despite changing conditions characterized a great deal of philanthropy. An example only more striking than a great many others is the will of Oliver Smith who died in Northampton, Massachusetts, in 1845. It provided for dowries for poor girls and for an apprenticeship system for poor boys. Such provisions were already largely antiquated. Yet the Smith bequest channeled many millions into this mold.¹¹ Deep-rooted precedents were followed in other matters all through the nineteenth century and well into our own in the founding or strengthening of agencies for helping widows, fallen females, orphans, lonely sailors, and for the blind, deaf, and

⁵ Wright, Louis B., *The first gentlemen of Virginia*, 95-116, San Marino, Huntington Library, 1940; Mason George C., *Annals of the Redwood Library and Athenaeum*, Newport, R. I., 10-42, Newport, 1891; Franklin, Benjamin, and D. Hall, *Some account of the Pennsylvania Hospital*, 5-8, Philadelphia, 1754; Morton, Thomas G., *History of the Pennsylvania Hospital*, 1-591, Philadelphia, 1897; Pumphrey, Ralph, *Compassion and protection: Dual motivation in social welfare*, *Social Service Review* 33: 27-28, 1959; Bremner, Robert H., *American philanthropy*, 5-19, Chicago, Univ. of Chicago, 1960.

⁶ Hale, George S., *The charities of Boston*, in Winsor, Justin, *Memorial history of Boston* 4: 641-674, Boston, Osgood and Co., 1881.

⁷ *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 34: 288-293; *Boston Gazette and County Journal*, March 24, 1760; Boston Fire, Documents and Correspondence, Boston Pub. Lib., MS 809.

⁸ Davis, Emerson, *The half century*, 102-344, Boston, 1851.

⁹ Soc. for the promotion of collegiate and theological education at the West, *An. Rep.*, 18-31, 1844; Curti, Merle, *The social ideas of American educators*, 63-71, New York, Scribner's, 1935; Griffin, Clifford S., *Their brothers' keepers*, 1-60, New Brunswick, Rutgers, 1960.

¹⁰ Masterman, N., ed., *A selection of passages and scenes to illustrate the social teaching and practical work of Thomas Chalmers, D.D.*, vi, 4, London, Constable, 1900; Bremner, Robert H., *From the depths: the discovery of poverty in the United States*, 51 ff., New York, N. Y. Univ. Press, 1956.

¹¹ Starr, Harris E., *Smith, Oliver*, *Dictionary of American Biography* 17: 329-330, New York, Scribner's, 1935.

otherwise handicapped. Similar precedents were followed in gifts providing hospitals for the sick, libraries for the community, and schools and colleges for the young.¹²

In making such gifts or bequests donors were of course often doing something which had never been done in their communities. They were thus creative in meeting needs not otherwise being met. Yet in another sense they were hardly being creative, for such privately founded and supported institutions were part of a long cultural tradition. On the other hand, it should be noted that originality and creativity in giving was not always foresighted or wise in long-range perspective. Many examples of this are to be found in the literature of philanthropy, particularly in litigation involving the "dead hand."¹³ Two in-

stances may serve to give concreteness to the point. On the very eve of the Civil War a Bostonian bequeathed a large sum to support the abolition movement. He could not of course have foreseen that national events would within the short space of four years make his bequest obsolete.¹⁴ Considerably later a fund was established in St. Louis to aid needy occupants of covered wagons heading westward: but railroads were already beginning to replace the older picturesque vehicle.¹⁵

Turning to the question of an American law of philanthropy one finds a picture fairly complex both by reason of our federal system and the tempo of social and economic changes. It is true, as Professor Wyllie has shown,¹⁶ that in 1819 the Supreme Court accepted as law the Virginia position which, by reason of local circumstances, was restrictive in discouraging private gifts to religious agencies engaged in philanthropic programs. But in 1844 the Court endorsed the more liberal and flexible positions of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. This, to be sure, did not sweep away the Virginia doctrine which actually influenced several states. But it did open the doors to greater freedom in giving which was to prove both advantageous and disadvantageous to social interests. It is worth noting that the scholarship cited by the Supreme Court and by counsel drew heavily on the record of English chancery courts and custom prior to the Elizabethan statutes of charitable uses of 1601. In the later nineteenth century and in our own times, the tendency toward flexibility and the encouragement of philanthropy have been expressed in statutes, especially those exempting gifts from taxation. It has also been expressed in court decisions emphasizing the *cy pres* doctrine and in a broader interpretation of what constitutes public interest in a particular gift or bequest than certain earlier decisions approved. On the other hand, abuses or alleged abuses of philanthropic funds have led

¹² Cary, Thomas G., *Memoir of Thomas Handasyd Perkins containing extracts from his diaries and letters*, 220-260, Boston, 1856; Brace, Charles Loring, *The dangerous classes of New York and twenty years' work among them*, 1-448, New York, 1880; Allan, William, *Life and work of John McDonogh*, Baltimore, 1886; Knapp, Samuel L., *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 55-350, New York, 1834; Teeters, Negley K., The early days of the Magdalen society of Philadelphia, *Social Service Review* 30: 158-167, 1956; Brown, William A., *Morris Ketchum Jessup*, 24-25, New York, Scribner's, 1910; Jones, Mrs. Frederick R., The education of the blind, in Goodale, Frances A., ed., *The literature of philanthropy*, 170-193, New York, 1893; Tiffany, Frances, *Charles Frances Barnard*, 2 ff., Boston, 1895; Finley, John Robert W. DeForest, *The Survey* 46: 439-441, 1931; Watson, Frank W., *The charity organization movement in the United States*, 49-86, New York, Macmillan, 1922; Dept. of Interior, Bureau of Ed., *Public libraries in the United States of America*, xvi, 814 ff., Washington, 1876; Ditzion, Sidney, *Arsenals of a democratic culture*, 129-164, Chicago, Amer. Lib. Assoc., 1947; Davidson, Robert, *A vindication of colleges and college endowments*, 15-26, Lexington, Ky., 1841; Thwing, Charles F., The endowment of colleges, *International Review* 2: 258-268, 1881; Sears, Jesse B., *Philanthropy in the history of American higher education*, 1-126, U. S. Bureau of Ed., Bull. 26, Washington, 1922.

¹³ Zollman, Carl, *American law of charities*, 4-15; Hayes, Ralph, Dead hands and frozen funds, *No. Amer. Rev.* 227: 607-614, 1929; Hall, Thomas C., Perpetual emoluments: taxation without representation, *Independent* 70: 898-900, 1911; Alvin W. West, clippings, Hanover Bank and Trust Co. collection on philanthropy, Wis. State Hist. Soc.; Taylor, Eleanor, The public accountability of charitable trusts and foundations, *Social Service Review* 25: 299-391, 1951; Commonwealth of Mass., H. of Rep. no. 58, special report of committee on judiciary on petition and memorial of trustees of the charity of Edward Hopkins, Harvard Univ. Archives; Gray, Roland, The trustees of the charity of Edward Hopkins, supplemental account, 1889-1943, Boston, 1948; Flick, Alexander C., *Samuel Jones Tilden*, 525-529, New

York, Dodd Mead, 1939; Guy, Jackson, The Fayerweather will litigation, *Univ. of Va. Alumni Bull.* 4 (n.s.): 297-303, 1904; *The dead hand*, 7-24, Cleveland, Cleveland Trust Co., 1921.

¹⁴ May, Samuel J., Antislavery Papers, will of Francis Jackson, Ms. Div., Bost. Pub. Lib. For the Charles Hovey case, see *William Lloyd Garrison, The story of his life by his children* 3: 477-478, 494, New York, Century, 1885-1889.

¹⁵ 161 Missouri: 262; Crowell, Chester T., Giving money away, *Sat. Even. Post* 148: 10, 1926.

¹⁶ Wyllie, Irvin G., The search for an American law of charity, 1776-1844, *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.* 48: 203-221.

on the state and federal level to legislative inquiries, refusal to incorporate a philanthropic agency, and regulatory laws. Such restrictions in the public interest, or what was regarded as public interest, resemble earlier regulatory devices in Victorian England.¹⁷ All these changes in our ideas about philanthropy and its administration, as in our laws, are related to English precedent and to later English history.

It is a moot question whether in our country unique conditions and experiences have modified the Old World heritage sufficiently to have resulted in an American civilization. But that civilization in America at least presents many significant differences from that in western Europe is beyond reasonable doubt. In American philanthropy one would therefore expect significant modifications of European precedents.

Of various institutions that have been regarded as characteristically American, foreign observers have attached special importance to the voluntary association. It has been used in far greater degree than in Great Britain in charitable, welfare, and educational enterprises. It developed early and has been sustained in organizations for mutual self-help among our immigrant groups, including the Jews, whose amplifications of Old World patterns have been noteworthy, especially in the twentieth century.¹⁸ Conditions on our frontiers, remote from centers of population and government, inspired a great deal of neighborly mutual self-help and reenforced the use of the voluntary association in education and welfare. Separation of church and state and the development of almost countless sectarian organizations encouraged extensive use of the voluntary association in all philanthropic enterprises. Another

factor has been the prolonged existence of slavery and the intensity of problems of race relations which gave wide scope to the philanthropic voluntary association to free and to help the Negro. The relation of man to land, so favorable to man, and the abundance of economic and social opportunities in a mobile society have also prolonged the American emphasis on the voluntary association and delayed the extension of public responsibility for individual security and well-being, with its much debated advantages and disadvantages. In brief, it is clear that Americans, while not inventing the voluntary association as a philanthropic device, have made far greater use of it in mass appeals for funds than has been the case in Great Britain where it was long assumed that philanthropy is the province of the upper classes.

The philanthropic foundation, which similarly derives from Europe, has also become so widely used, especially in the twentieth century, as to constitute in effect an American innovation.¹⁹ Since the role of foundations in American society is the subject of other papers in this session, I shall only call attention to the American characteristics reflected in its diversity and specialization, its business-like emphasis on efficiency, its relative flexibility, and its use of professional experts.

In the technique of fund-raising one also sees modifications of British example and developments so extensive as to warrant thinking of these as being an American innovation. Even in the campaigns for providing food, clothing, and medical supplies and services for the Greeks in their struggles for freedom in the 1820's and in the measures taken for the relief of the Irish famine-sufferers in the 1840's, Americans carried much further the methods also used at the time in the British Isles. These included raising funds and the gathering and transportation of food through such devices as collections in churches and factories, popular appeals through the press

¹⁷ Gray, B. Kirkman, *A history of English philanthropy*, 283-291, London, P. S. King, 1905; De Schweinitz, Karl, *England's road to social security*, 1-281, Philadelphia, Univ. of Pa., 1943; Beveridge, William H. (Lord), *Voluntary action*, 1-420, New York, 1948; Andrews, F. Emerson *Philanthropic giving*, 1-318, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1950; Sacks, Albert M., *The role of philanthropy*, also essays by Lowndes, Charles L. B., Clark, Elias, Prunty, Bert S., Jr., and Alford, Neill H., Jr., on subjects relating to law and philanthropy, *Virginia Law Rev.* 46: 391-538, 1960.

¹⁸ Bogan, Boris D., *Jewish philanthropy*, 1-391, New York, Macmillan, 1917; Charity and charitable institutions, *Jewish Encyclopedia* 3: 667-678; Cronbach, Abraham, Jewish pioneering in American social welfare, *American Jewish Archives* 3: 51-80, 1951; Ginzberg, Eli, *Report to American Jews on overseas relief, Palestine and refugees in the United States*, 1-92, New York, Harpers, 1942; Agar, Herbert, *The saving remnant*, New York, Viking, 1960.

¹⁹ Andrews, F. Emerson, *Philanthropic foundations*, 1-459, New York, Russell Sage, 1956; Gardner, John W., Foundation operating policies, *Assoc. Amer. College Bull.* 42: 78-85, 1956; Keppel, Frederick P., *The foundation: its place in American life*, 1-113, New York, Macmillan, 1930; Fosdick, Raymond B., *Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, 1-336, New York, Harper, 1952; Glenn, John M., Lillian Brandt, and F. Emerson Andrews, *Russell Sage Foundation, 1907-1946*, 2 v., New York, Russell Sage, 1947; Lester, Robert M., *Forty years of Carnegie giving*, 1-186, New York, Scribner's, 1941; Lindeman, Eduard C., *Wealth and culture*, 1-135, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1936.

and in great public meetings, theatrical and musical benefits, dances, and ladies' bazaars. In later American campaigns for disaster relief at home and abroad and for aiding refugees and other victims of persecution and war, these methods reached proportions unknown abroad.²⁰

Other devices for fund-raising may be regarded as truly American. The YMCA, which originated in England, developed in America the modern techniques of the "drive."²¹ This came increasingly to take on some of the characteristics of religious revivalism—zest for efficiency, social pressure, salesmanship, and publicity, cloaked in a comfortable idealism. Criticized by some for its overhead costs, including commissions for professional organizers, criticized also for appeals, especially in wartime, to "mob psychology," the "drive" has nevertheless extended the dimensions of philanthropy by involving virtually the whole community.²² The community trust,²³ designed to eliminate ill-advised private giving and to introduce into philanthropy a greater measure of

efficiency, together with the community chest,²⁴ is an American twentieth-century innovation which has also given a broader base to fund-raising than existed traditionally in America and elsewhere. In addition to these modifications, extensions, and outright innovations, American fund-raising has shown originality in the extensive use of the principle of giving on condition that the gift be matched by other donors. This of course stimulated the widening of interest in philanthropic projects.

Important, too, especially since 1913, has been the encouragement provided by tax exemption to giving for acceptable philanthropies.²⁵ Not until 1950, when the German Federal Republic introduced this provision into income tax legislation, had it been known abroad in anything comparable to the American pattern.²⁶ Finally, the recent entrance of the corporation and the trade union into giving for purposes beyond the immediate well-being of these agencies, has extended the scope of philanthropy.²⁷

Worthy of notice also is the American extension of philanthropy in agencies and for purposes which have counterparts elsewhere. An example is the American practice of using Red Cross contributions for the relief of civilians in disasters at home.²⁸ Another example is in the foreign missionary field.²⁹ The development of medical and educational services in connection with foreign missions cannot be regarded as a uniquely American contribution. But no country's foreign missions have done more pioneering in this field than those of the United States. American giving through non-official secular channels for dis-

²⁰ Dulles, Foster Rhea, *The American Red Cross: a history* 39-41, 149-151, 224, 258, 311, 313, 349, 361-363, 509, 531, 532, New York, Harpers, 1950; Pickett, Clarence E., *For more than bread*, 13-14, 21-22, 65-67, 108-109, 197-198, 201, 212-213, 223, 250, 258, 290-302, Boston, Little Brown, 1953; A. C. Marts, Historical sketch of the fund-raising profession and of Marts & Lundy, Inc., typescript, Marts & Lundy, Inc.; John Price Jones Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Univ., America's gift to France file, Greek war relief association, inc., etc.; obit. David A. Brown, *New York Times*, Dec. 24, 1958.

²¹ Hopkins, Charles H., *History of the YMCA in North America*, 596-601, New York, Assoc. Press, 1951.

²² Warren, George Washington, *History of the Bunker Hill Monument Association during the first century*, v, 5 ff., Boston, 1877; Klein, Philip, Drives—Money raising, *Ency. Soc. Sci.* 3: 238-241, New York, Macmillan, 1931; John Price Jones to Nelson Perkins, Sept. 20, 1919, on the nature and value of public appeal for philanthropy, John Price Jones ms. collection, Baker Library, Harvard, ms. no. 66; Arnett, Trevor, *Recent trends in higher education in the United States*, Gen. Ed. Board, New York, 1940; New United Fund cuts charity drives, *Nation's Business* 43: 36-47, 80-81, 1955; Seymour, Harold J., *Design for giving; the story of the National War Fund*, New York, Harper, 1947; Pimsleur, J. L., The fight for the charity dollar, *Nation* 186: 43-46, 65-66, 100-102, 1958; *New York Times*, Apr. 21, 1960.

²³ Hayes, Ralph, Dead hands and frozen funds, *No. Amer. Rev.* 227: 607-614, 1929; Carter, Leyton E., Wealth is for the living—not the dead, *Banker's Magazine* 122: 463-467, 1931; Rich, Wilmer Shields, National Council on Community Foundations to Merle Curti, May 6, 1958; *Community trusts of America, 1914-1950*, Nat. Com. on Foundations and Trusts for Community Welfare, Chicago, 1950; *Giving, U.S.A.*, Amer. Assoc. of Fund-Raising Counsel, New York, 1959.

²⁴ Seeley, John R. et al., *Community chest: a case study in philanthropy*, Toronto, Univ. of Toronto Press, 1957; King, Willford Isbell, *Trends in philanthropy*, New York, Nat'l Bureau of Economic Research, 1928; McMillen, Wayne, Financing social welfare service, *Social Work Year Book*, 260-267, 1954.

²⁵ Internal Revenue Code, 1954, *An act to revise the internal revenue of the United States*. Public law 591, Washington, Government Print. Office, 1954; Bremner, Robert H., *American philanthropy*, 158, 159-160, 174-175; Andrews, F. Emerson, *Philanthropic foundations*, *passim*.

²⁶ Clough, Shepard B., Philanthropy and the welfare state of Europe, *Pol. Sci. Quart.* 75: 87-92, 1960.

²⁷ Andrews, F. Emerson, *Corporation giving*, N. Y., Russell Sage, 1952; Prunty, Bert S., Jr., Love and the business corporation, *Va. Law Rev.* 46: 467-476, 1960; Samuel, Howard D., Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, to Merle Curti, June 25, 1958.

²⁸ Walrad, Ruth, Home services, typescript in library of the American Red Cross, Washington.

²⁹ Latourette, Kenneth, *A history of the expansion of Christianity*, 7 v., New York, Harpers, 1937-1945.

aster relief and rehabilitation abroad has features common to similar voluntary giving on the part of other people. But Americans cut new paths in developing agencies for overseas work in the fields of library development, educational programs, health, and welfare. In so doing, both individual philanthropists and foundations have extended benefit to countries that have been only slightly affected by Western educational and welfare concepts and institutions. Thus, they have returned in small part a great cultural debt to the Old World.

Using these old and new methods and agencies, what kind of contribution has American philanthropy made toward the enhancement of life both at home and in other countries? In this paper it is possible to give only a brief synopsis of the story.

In welfare, the contributions to understanding and advancement through the use of ever more far-reaching scientific techniques have been impressive, as the record of Russell Sage Foundation, to cite only one example, makes clear.³⁰ In one aspect of welfare, namely health, it is indisputable that philanthropy, especially in the last fifty years, has made contributions that are both original and significant. Any effort to evaluate these must, of course, take into account the pioneer work and the continuing contribution of agencies of local, state, and federal government. In some cases, notably in the discovery of causes and the demonstration of effective control of hookworm and yellow fever, the discoveries of government experts were adopted and given world-wide application by the Rockefeller agencies.³¹ Indeed, the close cooperation between philanthropy and public agencies in the sphere of health makes it hard to measure the contributions of each. These

things said, it remains true that individual donors have broken new ground, as the Eastman free dental clinics for children indicate,³² and as innumerable contributions to the improvement of hospital care suggest. Individual donors, large and small, have made possible great advances in medical research, notably in tuberculosis, polio, heart ailments, and other diseases.³³ The contributions to the improvement of medical education associated with the work of Flexner and to basic medical research,³⁴ as well as innovations in psychiatry and public health, have brought credit to many foundations, representative of which are the Milbank Fund, the Commonwealth Fund, the Kellogg Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Public education has been rightly considered one of America's major contributions to civilization. Many aspects of education generally regarded as original (though in many minds of debatable merit) have been initiated by private philanthropy. From a great store of examples one may be cited—the introduction into Boston's public schools by Mrs. Quincy Shaw of cooking, sewing, and household arts, as well as the continuation school, visiting teachers, and special

³⁰ Glenn, John M., Lilian Brandt, F. Emerson Andrews, *Russell Sage Foundation 1907-1946*, 2 v., New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1947; Russell Sage Foundation, *Annual Reports*, 1948-1959. See also Andrews, F. Emerson, *Scientific research expenditures by the larger foundations*, Washington, National Science Foundation, 1956.

³¹ Fosdick, Raymond B., *Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, 30-134; Rockefeller Sanitary Commission, Reports, 5 v., Washington, Offices of the Commission, 1911-1915; Flexner, Simon, and James T. Flexner, *William Henry Welch and the heroic age of American medicine*, New York, Viking, 1941; Shryock, Richard H., *National Tuberculosis Association, 1904-1954*, 1-309, New York, Natl. T. B. Assoc., 1957; Rusk, Howard A., Health dividend report: a review of foundation contributions and the results, *New York Times*, March 11, 18, 25, 1956.

³² George Eastman to Dr. H. J. Burkhart, Rochester, N. Y., March 1, 1927; Eastman to Dr. Abraham Flexner, New York City, Apr. 18, 1927; Eastman to Lord Ridell, London, June 15, 1927; Eastman to Giacomo De Martino, Italian Ambassador, Aug. 22, 1929, Eastman Personal Letter Books 23, 26, Eastman Papers, Rochester, N. Y.; *New York Times*, Apr. 23, 1927; Akerman, Carl W., *George Eastman*, 476-477, London, Constable, 1930.

³³ Treacy, Gerald C., Andrew Carney, philanthropist, 1794-1864, *Cath. Hist. Soc. Rec. and Stud.* 13: 101-105, 1919; Bolton, Sarah K., *Famous givers and their gifts*, 328-330, New York, 1896; Nathan Appleton to Dr. John C. Warren, Boston, Nov. 1, 1825, Warren Papers, 13, Mass. Hist. Soc.; Bishop, Joseph B., *A. Barton Hepburn*, 255-258, New York, Scribner's, 1923; clipping, Oct. 24, 1884, T. De Witt Talmage Collection, L. of C., for Vanderbilt gift; Lamb, Albert R., M.D., *The Presbyterian Hospital and the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center*, 1868-1943, 3-7, 39-62, 67 ff., New York, Col. Univ. Press, 1955; Warburg, Frieda Schiff, *Reminiscences of a long life*, 16, 54-70, New York, priv. printed, 1956; Marts, Arnaud C., *Philanthropy's role in civilization*, 69-88, New York, Harpers, 1953; Bogen, Boris D., *Jewish philanthropy*, 145-149, New York, Macmillan, 1917.

³⁴ Flexner, Abraham, *I remember*, 257-307, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1940; Fosdick, Raymond B., *John D. Rockefeller, Jr., a portrait*, 382-387, New York, Harpers, 1956; Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, *History, organization, present scope of the scientific work*, New York, 1911-; cf. Zinsser, Hans, The perils of magnanimity, a problem in American education, *Atlantic Monthly* 139: 246-250, 1927.

classes for the handicapped. Mrs. Shaw was also responsible for initiating school nursing and physical training. When the Boston school board dropped for lack of funds the kindergartens established by Elizabeth Peabody, Mrs. Shaw shouldered the burden until their success was so clearly demonstrated that they were permanently taken over by public authority.³⁵

In opening educational doors to Americans hitherto largely deprived of such advantages, philanthropy was indeed creative. A voluntarily supported liberal arts college was the first educational institution to give young women access to an academic degree. Vassar antedated the establishment in England of Girton, Newnham, and Lady Margaret Hall. The extension of educational opportunities to Negroes was in effect initiated by voluntarily supported religious agencies and greatly furthered by the benevolence of Peabody, Slater, Rockefeller, Jeanes, Phelps-Stokes, and Rosenwald.³⁶ If such philanthropic support overemphasized vocationalism and discouraged the assumption of responsibility by Southern taxpayers,³⁷ one would still have to concede that this philanthropy was, in the context of the time, greatly needed and seemingly directed toward self-help. Again, private philanthropy established schools for the handicapped

and pioneered in supporting special facilities for these children in public schools.³⁸ Although Great Britain in many respects led the way in adult education, the contributions in this field of John Lowell,³⁹ Peter Cooper⁴⁰ and others, opened opportunities that no other comparable agency did. In the establishment of libraries available to the public, a notable group of philanthropists preceded Carnegie. These pioneers do not detract from the stimulus the Scottish-born steel magnate gave to the public library movement. These contributions in balance outweigh the limitations of the Carnegie approach to the problem.⁴¹ In the twentieth century the Carnegie foundations led the way in revolutionizing adult education.⁴²

It is abundantly clear that both private and public schools and colleges are deeply indebted to the nineteenth-century donors of libraries, professorships, and scholarships. In raising to professional levels advanced teacher training, engineering, social work, and business administration, philanthropy broke new ground, as it did in supporting the movement for educational tests and measurements. One can only mention here the

³⁵ Lee, Joseph, The philanthropist's place in democracy, *The Family* 3: 139-140, 1922.

³⁶ Woodson, Carter G., *The education of the Negro prior to 1861*, 269-272, New York, Putnam, 1915; Wilcox, George A., *A Christian philanthropist: a sketch of the life of Mr. Daniel Hand*, 10-31, New York, Amer. Missionary Assoc., 1889; The Peabody Fund, *Christian Union* 6: 71, 1872; Bond, Horace Mann, *The education of the Negro in the American social order*, 127-144, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1934; Kiger, Joseph C., The large foundations in southern education, *Journal of Higher Education* 27: 125-132, 172 ff., 1956; Brawley, Benjamin, *Doctor Dillard of the Jeanes Fund*, 55-65, New York, Revell, 1930; Embree, Edwin R., and Julia Waxman, *Investment in people: the story of the Julius Rosenwald Fund*, 1-291, New York, Harpers, 1949; Stokes, Olivia Eggleston Phelps, *The story of Caroline Phelps Stokes*, 1-387; New York, Phelps Stokes Fund (typescript).

³⁷ Woodward, C. Vann, *Origins of the new south, 1877-1913*, 396-416, Baton Rouge, La. State Univ. Press, 1951; Harlan, Louis H., *Separate and unequal: public school campaigns and racism in the southern seaboard states, 1901-1915*, vii-xi, 48 ff., Chapel Hill, Univ. of N. C. Press, 1958; Jones, Lester W., The agent as a factor in the education of Negroes in the south, *Journal of Negro Education* 19: 28-37, 1950; Subject file, Philanthropies, George Foster Peabody Papers, L. of C.; Bond, H. M., *The education of the Negro*, 147-150; Reid, Ira de A., Philanthropy and minorities, *Phylon* 5: 266-270, 1944; Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt, to Merle Curti, June 4, 1958.

³⁸ The most famous example is Girard College, McMaster, John Bach, *Life and times of Stephen Girard, mariner and merchant*, 2 v., Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1918; Herrick, Cheesman A., *Stephen Girard, founder*, Philadelphia, Girard College, 1923; Grigsby, Rall I., The Des Moines House of Dreams, *School Executives Magazine* 51: 207-225, 1932; Boyd, Allie, Philanthropy in the form of gifts and endowments for elementary and secondary education, Master's Essay, Univ. of Chicago, 1923.

³⁹ Everett, Edward, *A memoir of Mr. John Lowell, Jun.*, Boston, 1840; Smith, Harriette Knight, *The history of the Lowell Institute*, Boston, 1898.

⁴⁰ Bennett, Charles A., *History of manual and industrial education up to 1870*, Peoria, Manual Arts Press, 1926; Nevins, Allan, *Abram S. Hewitt with some account of Peter Cooper*, 169, 175 ff., 269-280, New York, Harpers, 1935.

⁴¹ *Public libraries in the United States of America, special report*, Bureau of Ed., Dept. of Int., 1, 814-815, Washington, 1876; Miller, Durand, *Carnegie grants for library buildings 1890-1917*, New York, Carnegie Corporation, 1943; Sidney Ditzion to Merle Curti, March 27, 1957; *New York Times*, Oct. 5, 1951, 25: 1; Green, Samuel Swett, *Public library movement in the United States 1853-1893*, Boston, Boston Book, 1913; Koch, Theodore W., *A book of Carnegie libraries*, New York, Wilson, 1907; Shera, Jesse Hank, *Foundations of the public library*, 156-244, Chicago, Univ. of Chi. Press, 1949.

⁴² Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Reports of the president and of the treasurer, 1931-1951*, New York, Carnegie Corporation; Cartwright, Morse A., *Ten years of adult education*, New York, Macmillan, 1935.

pioneer support given by philanthropy to early experiments in progressive education,⁴³ to the encouragement of art and music appreciation in liberal arts colleges,⁴⁴ to general education, and to area programs. The Carnegie agencies, which played an important part in both encouraging educational experiments and in raising standards, also gave a national base for the programs of pensions for retired professors at a time when these were barely known.⁴⁵

No historian of American scholarship would fail to record the important contributions made in publicly supported universities to research in the humanities and social studies as well as in the natural sciences.⁴⁶ Yet it is fair to say that the achievements of American research in all these fields have stemmed in major proportions from philanthropic support. One need only recall the contributions to knowledge that rested on the rich collections of such institutions as the Boston Athenaeum, the American Antiquarian Society, the American Philosophical Society, and the libraries named for Lennox, Newberry, Crerar, Huntington, and Folger. The reputation of American archaeology moved forward in strides thanks to the support to overseas field work given by such donors as Catharine Lorillard Wolfe, Jacob Schiff, John D. Rockefeller, and

the Horace Rackhams.⁴⁷ Classical scholarship kept abreast with developments in the Old World in part by reason of the active interest and contributions of James Loeb⁴⁸ and the donors to the American School at Athens and the American Academy in Rome.⁴⁹ Generous foundation support enabled the American Law Institute to undertake the great cooperative Restatement of the Common Law, an enterprise which has proved useful to counsel and judges as well as to legal scholars.⁵⁰

But the contributions of philanthropy to scholarship also opened up virtually new fields. Long before the importance of reliable knowledge about Africa was generally recognized, an American foundation supported the pioneer survey of Lord Hailey.⁵¹ Charles Crane's interest in Russia enabled a young scholar to become one of our first authorities in Russian studies.⁵²

In this connection mention must be made of the initiation and support, chiefly by foundations, of scores of major aids to scholarship: the great bibliographies, indexes, and products of the new microphotographic techniques have facilitated inquiry in all the humanistic and social disciplines.

If foundations have nevertheless been criticized for inadequate support of humanistic scholarship, the criticism that they have done far too little for music and art has been even more pointedly made. Certainly what was done was small in relation to what education, welfare, health, and scientific research received.⁵³ For this there are

⁴³ The contributions of Nettie Fowler McCormick to the Francis Parker School in Chicago are documented in the McCormick Collection, State Historical Society of Wisconsin. For philanthropic support of Lincoln School see Cremin, Lawrence A., David Shannon and Mary E. Townsend, *A history of Teachers College Columbia University*, 109-113; also 97-98, New York, Col. Univ. Press, 1954.

⁴⁴ *Carnegie Corporation, President's report*, 1926, 15-18, and subsequent reports, especially those for 1929, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1935, 1936, 1937, etc.

⁴⁵ Flexner, Abraham, *Henry S. Pritchett: a biography*, 1-211, New York, Col. Univ. Press, 1943; Lester, Robert M., *Forty years of Carnegie giving*, 45-50, New York, Scribner's, 1941; Cattell, J. McKeen, *Carnegie pensions*, 1-253, New York, Science Press, 1919.

⁴⁶ Keppel, Frederick P., *Philanthropy and learning*, 1-175, New York, Col. Univ. Press, 1936; Curti, Merle, ed. *American scholarship in the twentieth century*, 8, 9, 76-78, 85, Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1953; Ogg, Frederick A., *Research in the humanistic and social sciences*, 1-454, New York, Century, 1928; Lester, Robert M., *Forty years of Carnegie giving*, 45-50, 57-63, 94-96; Fosdick, Raymond B., *Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, 145-265; Dunlap, Lester W., *American historical societies 1790-1860*, 62-64, 143, Madison, Univ. of Wis. Press, 1944; Laprade, William T., *Funds and foundations: a neglected phase*, *Amer. Assoc. Univ. Prof. Bull.* 38: 559-576, 1952; Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., type-script, *The historian and the research foundation*.

⁴⁷ Miner, Frances H., ed., *Horace H. Rackham and Mary A. Rackham Fund*, 22 ff., Ann Arbor, 1940.

⁴⁸ Sanborn, Ashton R., James Loeb, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* 21: 503-504; Shorey, Paul, *The Loeb Classics*, *Harvard Grads. Mag.* 36: 333-343, 1928; *American Jewish Yearbook* 39: 583, New York, 1937-1938; *New York Times*, May 29, 1933, 13: 1.

⁴⁹ Lord, Louis E., *A history of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 144-154, Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1947; Fine arts in philanthropy, Central Hanover Bank and Trust, 1937, in Wis. State Hist. Soc.; American Academy in Rome, folder in Foundation Library Center; *American Academy in Rome: twenty-fifth anniversary*, n.p., 1920.

⁵⁰ Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Report of the president and of the treasurer for the year ended Sept. 30, 1935*, 16, 24; 1941, 29.

⁵¹ Carnegie Corporation, *Report of the president . . . for the year ended Sept. 30, 1933*, 17-18; 1935, 35.

⁵² Rogers, Walter, Institute of Current World Affairs, to Merle Curti, May 19, 1958; Brodie, Donald M., Crane, Charles Richard, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* 22: 128-130, New York, Scribners, 1958.

⁵³ The fine arts in philanthropy, Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co., 1937, Wis. State Hist. Soc.

many reasons apart from the predominantly utilitarian cast of American life. It seems probable that foundations felt that the support of art and music was already being cared for at the hands of such "angels" as Henry Lee Higginson, father and supporter of the Boston Symphony Orchestra whose example stimulated many in other cities to make symphonic music possible in their communities.⁵⁴ The reward for what these men and women did gradually came as the supporting clientele for symphonies and operas increased in number. The tendency, already foreshadowed when the great foundations got under way, of private collectors of art to make their treasures available to the public,⁵⁵ also partly explains the slender record of the foundations in this field. And at least some men and women of wealth may have felt more or less unconsciously what Robert Crane so sharply expressed in 1907. Since wealth had been won at the expense of the poor, the Chicago plumbing magnate declared, it was a sort of second robbery for those possessing it to give for any purpose other than directly improving the lot of the poor.⁵⁶

In any evaluation of the role of donors in the field of art one must of course acknowledge the egotism, competitiveness, and indiscriminating taste of many men and women who spent great sums in collecting. Yet the fact that America now possesses museums that rank with and in some cases surpass the most renowned in the Old World, testifies to the imagination, judgment, and taste of many, or at least to a willingness to be guided by mentors possessing such qualities. That money and the flaunting of it in many cases figured prominently in art purchases is true, a truth that has brought caustic criticism on America from European connoisseurs. At least, however, the treasures were bought from those in the Old World who were willing to sell and had not been accumulated, as had often been the case abroad, by chicanery and looting in war.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Perry, Bliss, *Life and letters of Henry Lee Higginson*, 291-314, Boston, Atlan. Month. Press, 1921; Howe, M. A. DeWolfe, *The Boston Symphony Orchestra 1881-1931*, 178-182, Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1931; Leonard, Lewis Alexander, *Life of Alphonso Taft*, 195-204, New York, Hawe Publ. Co., 1920.

⁵⁵ Saarinen, Aline B., *The proud possessors*, 1-414, New York, Random, 1958.

⁵⁶ Andrews, Wayne, *Battle for Chicago*, 162-163, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1946.

⁵⁷ Shoolman, Regina, and Charles E. Statkin, *The enjoyment of art in America*, ix-xii, Phila. and N. Y., Lipincott, 1942; Barzun, Jacques, *God's country and mine*, 33, Boston, Little Brown, 1954.

That many of the art collectors showed little creativity or originality is, again, obvious. But if the great number closed their eyes to contemporary art in the desire to acquire old masters, good and bad, some did encourage contemporary art before Paris recognized its merits. American art was often ignored. Thomas Hart Benton certainly has a point in insisting that a truly original and great art must somehow be related to the people⁵⁸—a point often overlooked by the collectors. Still many did interest themselves in American art and artists.⁵⁹ In balance, when the sluggishness of the general public and of government in manifesting an interest is remembered, it seems fair to say that the role of philanthropy in making available some of the greatest treasures from all parts of the world, as well as from America, must be reckoned as one of its more creative contributions.

Closely related on one level to the effort to encourage the role of esthetic values in American life has been the more comprehensive growth of the civic spirit, as expressed in support for parks, buildings and civic improvement in general.⁶⁰ In a sense a legacy of the Greek and Roman emphasis on the community in contradistinction to the Judaeo-Christian concern with the individual, the civic spirit has developed in America largely without direct government initiative and support, with such notable exceptions as the building of the nation's capital and the creation and maintenance of state and national parks. In the history of every American city, the town fathers

⁵⁸ Benton, Thomas Hart, *Business and art*, in McCausland, Elizabeth, *Work for artists*, 21, New York, Amer. Artists Group Inc., 1947.

⁵⁹ See, for examples, Corcoran, William C., *Grandfather's legacy . . .*, 454, 535, Washington, 1877; correspondence between American artists and Corcoran, William W., *Corcoran Mss.*, L. of C.; Moore, Charles, *Washington past and present*, 226-229, New York, Century, 1929; *Fine arts in philanthropy*, 47 ff., New York, Central Hanover Bank and Trust, 1937; Kahn, Otto, *Art and America . . .*, 5, New York, 1924; Mechlin, Leila, *The Freer collection of art*, *Century Mag.* 51: 357-370, 1907; Isham, Samuel, and Royal Cortissoz, *History of American painting*, 208, New York, Macmillan, 1927; Larkin, Oliver W., *Art and life in America*, 325, 374, New York, Rinehart, 1949.

⁶⁰ Kennan, George, *E. H. Harriman. a biography* 2: 339-344, New York, Houghton, 1922; Moore, Charles, ed., *Plan of Chicago*, 38, 43, 121, Chicago, Commercial Club, 1909; Crawford, Andrew W., and Frank M. Day, *The existing and proposed outer park systems of American cities*, 38, Phila., Phila. Allied Organizations, 1904; Newmark, Harris, *Sixty years in southern California: 1853-1919*, 541, 614, 643, Boston and New York, Houghton, 1930.

and solid citizens who made or enlarged their fortunes while contributing to the industrial and commercial growth of the city, were spearheads of civic benevolence. What one such leader, Ichabod Washburn of Worcester, wrote in his autobiography, represented what hundreds of others might well have written. "During these forty-seven years of increase," wrote Washburn, "I have so far aimed to identify my interests with the growth and prosperity of the city as to contribute my share in whatever public improvements have been made."⁶¹ In later decades of the nineteenth and in the early twentieth century, the wives of these urban leaders began to play a similar role which greatly impressed many foreign visitors.⁶² These men and women took pride in the reputation of their city for benevolence, public spirit, and civic beauty. Occasionally gadflies took their community to task for not doing enough—Mathew Carey was a notable example in Philadelphia.⁶³ It was indeed often hard to raise enough money to carry through a public enterprise such as the Bunker Hill Monument in Massachusetts. But the sustained prodding and dedication of a few philanthropic patriots helped educate their fellow-citizens. Civic mindedness found an increasing expression in gifts of real estate for public parks: 44 per cent of those in Cleveland, 49 per cent of those in Portland, Oregon, were, to cite two examples, so acquired.⁶⁴ In some cases of course considerations of speculation, and of a desire to increase the value of land not given, were a factor. In many others genuine civic philanthropy seems to have been a major motive. Of importance, too, in the development of a willingness to give in interest of the esthetic and recreational facili-

ties in a city was the stimulus of a great commercially sponsored exposition: the role of the Chicago World's Fair in stimulating the renaissance of the midwest metropolis is well known. Nor, in all this, must one overlook the contributions of personal service to civic causes, often unrecognized and unrewarded though in some cases, as that of Robert W. De Forest, recognized by the unofficial title of the city's first citizen.⁶⁵

In certain cities the names of individuals are forever associated with particular civic improvements. There was Stephen Girard's bequest of \$500,000 to the city of Philadelphia to improve the Delaware River waterfront and to widen and pave streets, in order, he said, to diminish the tax burden of those least able to pay.⁶⁶ Significant and for its time original was the gift of a group of New Yorkers, including Harriman and Morgan, which made possible the preservation of the natural beauty of the Palisades and of Bear Mountain.⁶⁷ William Kent salvaged and took steps to preserve the giant redwoods north of San Francisco.⁶⁸ Memorable too are the contributions to Rochester's civic consciousness associated with George Eastman⁶⁹ and the fund established by George Robert White to create in greater Boston works of public beauty and utility not to be expected from the city treasury.⁷⁰ Other examples are legion.

In the field of tenement improvement and low-cost housing, private philanthropy, not govern-

⁶¹ Cheever, Henry T., *Autobiography and memorials of Ichabod Washburn*, 54, Boston, 1878.

⁶² See, for example, Lieber, Francis, *The stranger in America*, 133, London, 1834; Royal British Commission, Chicago Exhibition, *Woman's mission. A series of Congress papers on the philanthropic work of women by eminent writers*, New York, Scribner's, 1893; Vay de Vaya and Luskod, Monsignor Count Piter, *The inner life of the United States*, 230, London, John Murray, 1908.

⁶³ Carey, Mathew, *A solemn address to the mothers, wives, sisters and daughters of citizens of Philadelphia*, 6, 50, Philadelphia, 1837; Epstein, Abraham, *Do the rich give to charity?* *American Mercury* 23: 22-30, 1931; Clews, Henry, *Fifty years in Wall Street*, 540, New York, Irvin Pub. Co., 1908.

⁶⁴ Crawford, Andrew W., and Frank M. Day, *The existing and proposed outer park systems of American cities*, 38, Phila., Phil. Allied Organizations, 1904. For private gifts of parks to Chicago see Moore, Charles, ed., *The plan of Chicago*, 43, Chicago, Commercial Club, 1909.

⁶⁵ Finley, John, Robert W. de Forest, *Survey* 66: 439-441, 1931; Brandt, Lillian, *Growth and development of AICP [N. Y. Assn. for Improving the Conditions of the Poor] and COS [Charity Organization Society of the City of N. Y.]*, New York, Community Service Society of N. Y., 1942; *New York Times*, May 7, 1931.

⁶⁶ McMaster, John Bach, *Life and times of Stephen Girard* 1: v, Phila., Lippincott, 1918.

⁶⁷ Pusey, Merlo J., *Charles Evans Hughes* 1: 214, New York, Macmillan, 1951; Kennan, E. H. *Harriman* 2: 339-344. For the bequest of Robert Marshall of a trust fund for the preservation of wilderness conditions in outdoor America see *New York Times*, Nov. 14, 1940, 27: 8.

⁶⁸ *Biog. Directory of the American Congress 1774-1927*, 1176, Washington, Govt. Printing Office, 1928; Kent, William, *Land tenure and public policy*, *American Economics Review* 9: supp. 1, 213-223, 1919; Lindsey, B. B., *Conservation Congressman*, *Survey* 25: 339-341, 1910.

⁶⁹ McKelvey, Blake, *Rochester the flower city 1855-1890*, 34-35, 273-274, Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1949; Ackerman, Carl W., *George Eastman*, 324-495, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1930.

⁷⁰ Dame, Lawrence, *Wanted a way to spend \$8,000,000*, *Sat. Ev. Post* 218: 12, 1949; letter from James J. McCarthy, Mgr. of George Robert White Fund to Merle Curti, Aug. 4, 1958.

ment, took the lead. The pioneer work in England associated with such names as George Peabody, Octavia Hill, and others stimulated similar enterprises in New York and other cities in which such men and women as Lennox, Muhlenberg, Paine, Gleason, Phelps-Stokes, Ginn, and, especially, Alfred T. White figure with special prominence.⁷¹ Beginning with Russell Sage, foundations worked in this field. The John B. Pierce Foundation, the Loose Fund, the McLean Trust, the Bernheim Foundation, the Brundage Charities, the Robert Marshall Williams Fund, the Kaufman Foundation, and the Old Dominion Foundation have made useful contributions. That what has been done both as private philanthropy and in stimulating government action has not been enough, need not deprive of credit those to whom credit is due.

The story even in broadest outline must take account of the fresh approach given to the whole idea of play in its personal and social aspects. Here the great pioneer was Joseph Lee,⁷² but he was only one of many colleagues, including well-known and less well-known figures in the social settlement movement. In time what private philanthropic initiative undertook in the sphere of play and recreation came to have government recognition and partial support, as in the years of the New Deal.

⁷¹ Bremner, Robert H., *The big tenement: history of a New York tenement house*, *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 64: 54-62, 1958; Chase, Ellen, *Tenant friends in old Thetford with a preface by Octavia Hill*, 18-19, London, Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1929; sketches in *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* of Felix Adler, Robert F. Cutting, Robert W. deForest, William Brown McKinley, Elizabeth Price Martin, Darius O. Mills, *et al.*

⁷² *National Joseph Lee Day Pamphlet*, New York, 1938; Lee, Joseph, Philanthropist's place in a democracy, *The Family* 3: 139-143, 1922; The community, maker of men, *Survey Graphic* 49: 576-579, 1923; Play as an antidote to civilization, *Playground* 5: 110-126, 1911.

Finally, the note of efficiency in civic enterprise owes much to the philanthropic initiative and support in the second decade of the present century of the bureaus of municipal research. These have come to be, as they should be, largely self-supporting.⁷³ The pioneer concern of Russell Sage Foundation in city planning has influenced other foundations. Yet as late as 1958 it was reported that the Ford Foundation, after considering a large grant to an institution for civic planning, decided to work through universities lest the courts rule that this area is too controversial or at least too political to merit direct philanthropic support.⁷⁴

This brief account of the way in which American philanthropy has developed from its Old World origins, of the newer methods and agencies that have been adopted or further developed in the United States, and of the kind of private contributions that have been made in various fields has done scant justice to the dedicated work of many individuals and foundations. But it at least suggests the scope and character of what has been done. And it gives support to the thesis that, whatever its limitations, private philanthropy has played a telling part especially in the America of the last seventy-five years in opening the way to a larger emphasis on the esthetic and civic components in the national life. In these respects, in the role that many donors and some foundations have played, and in the distinctive relationships with government that have developed, American philanthropy has a record that is genuinely creative.

⁷³ Ackerman, Carl W., *George Eastman*, 402-403, London, Constable and Co. Ltd., 1930; George Eastman to Henry A. Strong, March 9, 1915, Eastman Personal Letter Book 9, Eastman Papers.

⁷⁴ Clark, Elias, The limitation on political activities, *Va. Law Rev.* 46: 450, 1960.